

Application No. 10/061,949
Reply to Office Action dated November 4, 2004

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are presented for further examination. Claims 1-17 remain unamended. Claims 18-21 are new.

In the Office Action mailed November 4, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,054,024 ("Whetsel").

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the basis for the rejection and requests reconsideration and further examination of the claims.

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the time spent in a telephone interview on November 30, 2004. During that interview, the Examiner indicated dependent claim 2 would be allowable over the Whetsel reference inasmuch as the element of a pull-down function associated with each respective dedicated clock generator is not taught or disclosed in Whetsel.

In response thereto, applicant has added new claims 18-21. Claim 18 is essentially a combination of claim 1 and dependent claim 2, which recited the pull-down function. Similarly, claim 19 is a combination of independent claim 5 and dependent claim 6. New claim 20 is a combination of independent claim 9 and dependent claim 11. Independent claim 21 is a combination of independent claim 14 and dependent claim 15. Inasmuch as all of these independent claims include the pull-down function, applicant respectfully submits that these claims are clearly allowable over the Whetsel reference.

During the telephone interview with the Examiner, it was noted that Figures 1 and 2 contained errors and ambiguities. More particularly, it appeared to the Examiner that lines 55 and 50 in Figure 1 were coupled together at two locations. In addition, it did not appear to the Examiner that clock generators TCK, DCK, and nDCK were coupled to line 50. In addition, in Figure 2 the dedicated clock generators in both of the circuits shown there were labeled DCK instead of having one of them labeled TCK and the other DCK. In addition, the signal `tst_dcpathoff` was indicated as being the same signal for each clock generator, which was incorrect.

Applicant is submitting herewith substitute formal Figures 1 and 2 wherein the connection between the clock generators and line 50 is now clearly shown with a black dot, as is

Application No. 10/061,949
Reply to Office Action dated November 4, 2004

the convention in electrical schematics. In addition, there is no connection between line 55 and line 50 or the dedicated clock signals because there is no black dot where these two lines intersect. Blocks 20 and 40 have both been labeled UDI and ST20, respectively.

In Figure 2, each of the pull-down signals has been differentiated with a subscript number, $tst_dcpathoff_1$ and $tst_dcpathoff_2$, as indicated. In addition, the dedicated clock generator for the TCK signal has now been shown in Figure 2. No new matter has been added.

The specification at page 6, line 3 has been amended to identify more clearly the pull-down signals $tst_dcpathoff_1$ and $tst_dcpathoff_2$ in Figure 2. Support for this clarification is found at page 5, line 27 through page 6, line 5 of the specification.

During the telephone interview with the Examiner, applicant's undersigned representative emphasized the fact that Whetsel teaches a single clock generator or oscillator 154 (see Figure 11). It is this single clock signal that is sent to each device select module 18 (DSM) and then to a plurality of predefined circuits 16a-b after being buffered at the device select module 18. Nowhere does Whetsel teach or suggest using a dedicated clock generator for each clock signal as recited in claim 1 and each of the other independent claims 5, 9, and 14.

Although Whetsel shows in Figure 6 a tristate buffer to output the DTCK signal, the buffer is not a generator. Rather, the buffer is used to strengthen the TCK signal prior to its reception at the predefined circuits 16a-b.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in this application are clearly allowable over the Whetsel reference. In the event the Examiner disagrees or finds minor informalities in the claims, applicant's undersigned representative respectfully requests a further telephone interview with the Examiner or the Examiner may contact applicant's undersigned representative at (206) 622-4900 in order to expeditiously resolve prosecution of this application.

Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing this case to issuance is respectfully solicited.

Application No. 10/061,949
Reply to Office Action dated November 4, 2004

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC



E. Russell Tarleton
Registration No. 31,800

ERT:alb

Enclosure:

1 Sheet of Replacement Drawings (Figures 1 and 2)

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6300
Seattle, Washington 98104-7092
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

851763.424 / 540117_1.DOC